

Young Supernova Remnants: Issues and Prospects

Christopher F. McKee

University of California, Berkeley, CA USA

Abstract.

The dynamical evolution of young supernova remnants (YSNRs) is governed by the density distribution in the ejecta and in the ambient medium. Analytic solutions are available for spherically symmetric expansion, including the transition from the ejecta-dominated stage to the Sedov-Taylor stage. YSNRs serve as valuable physics laboratories, in which we can study nucleosynthesis, the early evolution of compact objects, pulsar physics, particle acceleration, the formation and destruction of dust, hydrodynamics at high Reynolds numbers, shock physics at high Mach numbers, and the effects of thermal conduction in interstellar plasmas. There are several challenges in YSNR research: (1) Where are the very young remnants in the Galaxy? We expect 5-10 to have occurred since Cas A, but with the possible exception of a remnant reported at this conference, none have been seen. (2) Can very young SNRs produce gamma-ray bursts? The acceleration of a shock in the outer layers of a supernova, first suggested by Colgate, can account for gamma-ray bursts such as that believed to be associated with SN 1998bw, and more powerful explosions can account for the energies seen in many cosmological bursts. (3) The Connections Challenge: Can one infer the nature of the supernova and its progenitor star from observations of the YSNR?

INTRODUCTION

Young supernova remnants (YSNRs) are fascinating objects. Just as star formation connects the interstellar medium (ISM) with stars through the process of gravitational contraction, so YSNRs complete the connection back to the ISM through a titanic explosion driven by the release of either gravitational or nuclear energy. An SNR is produced by the interaction of the ejecta with the ambient medium or, alternatively, by the effects of a pulsar left behind by the explosion. The ambient medium can be circumstellar—i.e., matter ejected by the progenitor or its companion—or interstellar. I shall use the term “YSNR” to denote an SNR in which the total mass ejected by the star, both the circumstellar mass, $M_{\text{cir}*}$, and the mass ejected by the supernova explosion, M_{ej} , exceeds the mass of swept-up interstellar gas, $M_{\text{sw, is}}$ —i.e., $M_{\text{cir}*} + M_{\text{ej}} > M_{\text{sw, is}}$.

In this article, I shall first review the dynamics of YSNRs. I shall then discuss

YSNRs as physics laboratories that enable us to address problems that are difficult or impossible to address on Earth. Finally, I shall address several challenges posed by YSNRs, including whether they can be the progenitors of gamma-ray bursts.

REVIEW OF YSNR DYNAMICS

The dynamics of a YSNR is driven by the interaction between the ejecta and the surrounding matter. The first step in analyzing the dynamics is therefore to determine the density structure of the ejecta. Chevalier [1] began this effort by working out the dynamics of the blast wave produced by a core-collapse supernova as it propagated in the envelope of a red giant. Subsequently, Chevalier & Soker [2] approximated the envelope of a blue supergiant as having a power-law density distribution with $\rho_0 \propto r^{-17/7}$, which gives rise to a Primakoff blast wave in which the density and velocity are power-laws in radius. A general treatment of the generation of the ejecta density profile (under the assumption of spherical symmetry) was given by Matzner & McKee [3], and we shall briefly review their results here.

They began by developing an analytic expression for the velocity of the supernova shock as it propagates through the progenitor star. In the interior, one expects $v_s \propto [E_{\text{in}}/m(r)]^{1/2}$, where $m(r) \equiv M(r) - M_{\text{rem}}$ is the mass of the ejecta inside r . When the shock reaches the atmosphere, it accelerates down the density gradient according to $v_s \propto [m(r)/\rho_0(r)r^3]^\alpha$, with $\alpha \simeq 0.19$. A general expression for the shock velocity, that is accurate throughout the envelope and atmosphere, is [3]

$$v_s = A \left[\frac{E_{\text{in}}}{m(r)} \right]^{1/2} \left[\frac{m(r)}{\rho_0(r)r^3} \right]^\alpha. \quad (1)$$

It is possible to evaluate the coefficient A analytically as well [4]. This expression is accurate to within 2% in stellar envelopes. It should be contrasted with the result of the Kompaneets approximation, which gives $v_s \propto [E_{\text{in}}/\rho_0(r)r^3]^{1/2}$ and fails in both the interior and the atmosphere.

With this result as a base, Matzner & McKee were able to determine approximate analytic expressions for the density distribution of the ejecta that are quite general. The distribution in the outer ejecta can be approximated as a power-law in velocity,

$$\rho \propto (v_{\text{ej}}/v)^{\ell_\rho}, \quad (2)$$

where v_{ej} is the maximum velocity of the ejecta. In general, ℓ_ρ can depend on position; indeed, by comparing with numerical models, Dwarkadas and Chevalier [5] find that an exponential approximation fits best for Type Ia SNRs. In the outer ejecta, the value of ℓ_ρ is typically greater than 5, which means that the energy as well as the mass of the ejecta are concentrated in the interior.

In the ejecta-dominated stage of evolution of SNRs ($M_{\text{ej}} > M_{\text{sw}}$), there are two shocks: the blast-wave shock that advances into the ambient medium at velocity v_b and a reverse shock that propagates back into the ejecta with a relative velocity v_r

[6]. Between the shocks lie the shocked ambient medium and the shocked ejecta, separated by a contact discontinuity. For the case of a steep density gradient in the ejecta ($\ell_\rho > 5$), the ejecta-dominated stage of evolution can be divided into two parts: First, there is a brief initial stage described by the Hamilton-Sarazin [7] similarity solution, in which the velocity of the blast-wave shock v_b is approximately equal to v_{ej} . In a medium of constant density, the radius of the blast wave expands with time as $R_b \simeq 1.10v_{ej}t(1 - at^{3/2})$, where a is a numerical constant. The velocity of the reverse shock propagating back into the ejecta satisfies $v_r \propto t^{3/2}$. Once the blast-wave velocity has slowed significantly below v_{ej} , the evolution enters a second self-similar phase of evolution, which is described by the Chevalier-Nadyozhin solution [8] [9]. In this solution, the blast-wave radius varies as $R_b \propto t^{1-3/\ell_\rho}$; the velocities of the blast-wave shock and the reverse shock both scale as t^{-3/ℓ_ρ} .

When the mass of the swept-up ambient medium exceeds the mass of the ejecta, the dynamics approaches that of an adiabatic blast wave produced by a point explosion. The Sedov-Taylor similarity solution for this problem has $R_b \propto (E_{in}t^2/\rho_0)^{1/5}$. Many historical remnants are in transition between the ejecta-dominated stage and the Sedov-Taylor stage, and McKee & Truelove [10] proposed an approximate analytic solution that describes the evolution from the Chevalier-Nadyozhin stage through the Sedov-Taylor stage. This solution was developed by Truelove & McKee [11] (note the erratum in [12]), who defined the characteristic quantities

$$R_{ch} \equiv (M_{ej}/\rho_0)^{1/3}, \quad (3)$$

$$v_{ch} \equiv (E_{in}/M_{ej})^{1/2}, \quad (4)$$

$$t_{ch} \equiv R_{ch}/v_{ch}, \quad (5)$$

and then gave approximate expressions for R_b/R_{ch} , v_b/v_{ch} , and v_r/v_{ch} as functions of t/t_{ch} (or in some cases, t/t_{ch} in terms of R_b/R_{ch} , etc). This solution has been successfully compared with the observations of Tycho's SNR by Hughes [13].

Actual YSNRs present a rich range of phenomena that go well beyond the simple dynamics described above. For example, if the YSNR has an embedded pulsar, then the pulsar nebula can be dramatically transformed by the reverse shock [14]. Deviations from spherical symmetry can have major effects. Such deviations can be due to asymmetries in the explosion (e.g., [15]), the ambient medium [16], or due to instabilities (e.g., [17] [18]). Theoretical and observational studies of these effects are given in these conference proceedings.

YSNRS AS PHYSICS LABORATORIES

Young SNRs provide extreme environments in which novel physical effects can be studied. The role of YSNRs in cosmic ray acceleration is reviewed elsewhere in this volume by Steve Reynolds. Some YSNRs harbor pulsars, and these objects are discussed by Manchester and by Gaensler elsewhere in these proceedings. Here I

shall briefly comment on how YSNRs can serve as physics laboratories for the study of nucleosynthesis, dust formation and destruction, and interstellar hydrodynamics.

Nucleosynthesis

YSNRs provide laboratories to test both the theory of the formation of the elements and the theory of supernova explosions. X-ray spectroscopy is crucial, since optical spectroscopy is often sensitive to only a small fraction of the mass of the ejecta. Spatially resolved X-ray spectroscopy is now available with *Chandra* and with *XMM-Newton*. The Astronomy and Astrophysics Survey Committee (AASC) [19] has recommended that an even more powerful instrument be built during the coming decade, *Constellation-X*. Consisting of four X-ray telescopes, *Constellation-X* would have an energy resolution $E/\Delta E \sim 300 - 5000$ over the energy range 0.25-40 keV. Its effective area would be about 20-100 times that of existing instruments, and it would have an angular resolution of about 15 arcsec. A particularly strong clue on the nucleosynthesis that occurs in YSNRs is provided by radioactive elements, which can be studied with the INTEGRAL spacecraft that is due to be launched in 2001. The Panel on High-Energy Astrophysics from Space of the AASC recommended an Explorer Class mission for nuclear line X-ray spectroscopy.

Dust Formation and Destruction

Most of the refractory elements like silicon and iron in the interstellar medium are contained in dust grains. Observations of isotopic anomalies in meteorites suggest that dust forms in core-collapse supernovae [20]. This idea received observational confirmation when SN1987A showed several signs of dust formation, including dust emission, dust absorption, and a drop in the line intensities of the refractory elements at the time at which the dust emission appeared [21]. Whereas observations of dust emission suggest that only about $(1 - 10) \times 10^{-4} M_{\odot}$ of dust formed in the supernova, observations of the extinction and of the diminution of the refractory lines—which measure all the dust, not just the hot dust—suggest that most of the refractory elements in the ejecta could have gone into dust [21]. From a theoretical perspective, supernovae have long been thought to be sites of dust formation: Once grains are injected into the ISM they are subject to efficient destruction by SNR shocks, so it is essential that the refractory elements be injected in solid form in order to account for their large depletions (e.g., [22]). Even in this case, significant growth of refractory grains is inferred to occur in the ISM [21] [23].

However, the same shock processes that are effective at destroying grains in the ISM can destroy them in YSNRs. How can the grains survive the reverse shock? How can they survive being embedded in the hot gas in the interior of an SNR? How can they survive being decelerated from velocities in excess of 10^3 km s^{-1} ? Sputtering is the dominant process of grain destruction in this case [24] [25]. The effectiveness of sputtering is enhanced by the shattering of the grains that occurs

in shocks, since that increases the grain surface area [26]. Furthermore, recent ISO observations have cast doubt on the idea that core collapse supernovae are the dominant source of interstellar grains: Douvion, Lagage, & Cesarsky [27] argue that only a small fraction of the silicon in Cas A is microscopically mixed into the regions necessary to make silicates, whereas Arendt, Dwek, & Mosely [28] find that the spectrum of Cas A indicates that the silicates that do form are not of the type that is typical of interstellar grains.

In order to understand how dust is formed and destroyed in YSNRs, further observational and theoretical work is needed. The *Space Infrared Telescope Facility* (SIRTF) and the *Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy* (SOFIA) will provide valuable new data. Further in the future, the *Next Generation Space Telescope* (NGST) offers the possibility of observing the infrared spectra of grain-producing elements and of the grains themselves at high angular resolution.

Interstellar Hydrodynamics

YSNRs offer a fascinating laboratory in which to study hydrodynamic processes in the ISM. As described by McCray elsewhere in these proceedings, observations of the youngest nearby SNR, the remnant of SN1987A, even provide us with an opportunity to observe the *temporal evolution* of these hydrodynamic processes.

YSNRs produce extremely powerful shocks, with shock velocities that can exceed 10^4 km s⁻¹ and Mach numbers $\mathcal{M}$ that can exceed 10^3 . These shocks may be strongly modified by the acceleration of cosmic rays. Indeed, Hughes, Rakowski, and Decourchelle [29] have analyzed *Chandra* observations of the SMC SNR E0102.2-7219 and have concluded that the most natural interpretation of the low electron temperatures they observe is that most of the shock energy has gone into cosmic rays. A key issue of shock physics that can be addressed through observations of YSNRs is the degree of collisionless heating of electrons behind fast shocks. Ghavamian et al [30] have studied optical emission from nonradiative shocks in several SNRs (the Cygnus Loop, RCW 86, and Tycho), and they infer that the electron heating efficiency falls as the shock velocity increases: they find $T_e/T_i \sim 0.7 - 1$ in the Cygnus Loop ($v_s \sim 300$ km s⁻¹), ~ 0.3 in RCW 86 ($v_s \sim 600$ km s⁻¹), and $\lesssim 0.1$ in Tycho ($v_s \sim 2000$ km s⁻¹). However, they did not allow for the possibility that some of the energy of the shocked gas is in cosmic rays, as found by Hughes et al [29]. Further studies of shock physics using both optical and X-ray observations will be very illuminating.

A problem of fundamental importance in astrophysics is the interaction of a shock wave with a density inhomogeneity (a “cloud”). Astrophysical plasmas are generally inhomogeneous, and shocks are ubiquitous because these plasmas can typically cool to temperatures well below those associated with the violent events that occur in them. Once the shock has passed the cloud, this problem reduces to that of a cloud embedded in a flow, or, equivalently, a clump of ejecta interacting with the ambient medium (an “interstellar bullet”). These problems have been studied both

theoretically (e.g., [31], [32], [33]) and in the laboratory [34]. The clouds are subject to both thermal evaporation and hydrodynamic stripping; the first process plays a key role in the three-phase model of the ISM [35]. Magnetic fields have a strong effect on both processes; the effective conductivity in a magnetized, collisionless plasma remains uncertain. The combined effects of hydrodynamic stripping and thermal conduction are invoked in the model of turbulent mixing layers [36] [37], in which it is assumed that conduction is so efficient that the mixed gas starts with an initial temperature that is determined only by mass and energy conservation, but not so efficient that it affects the radiative cooling of the gas. As yet, there is no direct observational evidence that the boundary layers of shocked clouds are described by turbulent mixing layers, but YSNRs provide an ideal laboratory for studying this question, as well as for determining the fate of the “interstellar bullets” seen in the jet in Cas A [38] and for addressing many other problems in interstellar gas dynamics.

CHALLENGE: WHERE ARE THE VERY YOUNG SNRS IN THE GALAXY?

No supernova remnants are known in the Galaxy since Cas A exploded more than 300 years ago, with the possible exception of a very young SNR in the Galactic Center reported at this meeting [39]. Van den Bergh & Tammann [40] cite a range of estimates for the Galactic supernova rate; perhaps the best is from observations of SNe in other galaxies, which gives $8.4h^2$ per century, where h is the Hubble constant normalized to $100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. Taking $h = 0.63$ from a recent “concordance model” based on observations of the cosmic microwave background and large scale structure [41], we find a Galactic SN rate of 3.3 per century. Subsequently, van den Bergh & McClure [42] estimated a rate of $1.7 - 1.9$ per century for the same value of h . McKee & Williams [43] analyzed data on the OB associations in the Galaxy and estimated that the rate of core-collapse supernovae is 2.0 per century; including Type Ia’s, the total SN rate becomes 2.3 per century (note that this estimate is independent of h). In 300 years, we therefore expect that 5-10 SNe have exploded in the Galaxy. Where are their remnants?

Most of these SNe are core-collapse SNe that originated in associations. McKee & Williams [43] worked out the birthrate of associations in the Galaxy based on observations of radio H II regions, radio free-free emission, and N II $\lambda 122 \mu\text{m}$ emission. They adopted an IMF based on the work of Scalo [44], in which $d\mathcal{N}_*/d\ln m_* \propto m_*^{-1.5}$, slightly steeper than the Salpeter value. If $8M_\odot$ is the lower mass limit for core-collapse SNe, then half the missing SNRs had progenitors less massive than $13 M_\odot$. Under the assumption that each association has five consecutive generations of star formation (lasting for a total of 18.5 Myr), they estimated that the birthrate of associations that eventually produce at least $\mathcal{N}_{*h}$ stars more massive than $8 M_\odot$ is

$$\dot{\mathcal{N}}_a(> \mathcal{N}_{*h}) = 0.33 \left(\frac{7200}{\mathcal{N}_{*h}} - 1 \right) \text{ Myr}^{-1}, \quad (6)$$

where the largest association in the Galaxy has $\mathcal{N}_{*h} \simeq 7200$ high-mass stars. They extrapolated this distribution down to associations with 100 stars per generation, or 500 stars altogether; for their IMF, this corresponds to a minimum value of $\mathcal{N}_{*h} \simeq 1.3$. From this distribution, one can infer that half of these missing SNRs occurred in associations in which about 35 SNe have already occurred. To find out where in the Galaxy the SNe are likely to have occurred, we use the spatial distribution of associations from reference [43]

$$\frac{d\dot{\mathcal{N}}_a}{dA} = \dot{\mathcal{N}}_a(> \mathcal{N}_{*h}) \left[\frac{\exp(-R/H_R)}{A_{\text{eff}}} \right] \quad (3 \text{ kpc} \lesssim R \lesssim 11 \text{ kpc}), \quad (7)$$

with a radial scalelength $H_R \simeq 3.5 \text{ kpc}$ and an effective area $A_{\text{eff}} = 47 \text{ kpc}^2$. From this we can infer that half the missing SNRs are between 3 and 6 kpc from the Galactic Center, which includes the highly obscured molecular ring; other SNRs could lie on the far side of the ring, where the obscuration is even greater.

We conclude that many of the missing very young SNRs are either highly obscured or located in regions that have been evacuated by previous SNRs. In this latter case, the SNR is “muffled” by the cavity: the ejecta remain in free expansion out to a radius of about $20[(M_{\text{ej}}/10M_{\odot})(10^{-2}\text{cm}^{-3}/n_{\text{H}})]^{1/3} \text{ pc}$ and radiate their energy less efficiently than in denser environments [32]. YSNRs like Cas A, which is interacting with circumstellar matter, or the Crab, which is a plerion, would be easily seen throughout the Galaxy, however; we conclude that the progenitors of such SNRs are relatively rare.

Two projects recommended by the AASC could dramatically improve the census of YSNRs in the Galaxy: The *Energetic X-ray Imaging Survey Telescope (EXIST)* will survey the sky in the energy range 5-300 keV with 300 arcsecond resolution. It will be able to detect highly obscured SNRs. The *LOW Frequency ARray (LO-FAR)* is a radio telescope with a square kilometer of collecting area at wavelengths between 200 and 1000 cm and an angular resolution of 1 arcsec. With these capabilities, it will be extremely sensitive to the nonthermal radio emission from YSNRs.

CHALLENGE: CAN VERY YOUNG SNRS MAKE GAMMA-RAY BURSTS?

Gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) remain one of the great puzzles in astrophysics more than 30 years after their discovery (see Piran [45] for a review). There are several arguments suggesting that GRBs are associated with the deaths of massive stars: supernova explosions are the most energetic phenomenon known to occur outside galactic nuclei; observations of GRBs with afterglows have suggested that they may be associated with star-forming regions (e.g., [46]); and finally, GRB 980425 appears

to be temporally and spatially associated with the unusual supernova SN1998bw [47]. Long before there was any observational evidence for an association of GRBs with massive stars, Colgate [48] suggested that GRBs could be produced by the emission from accelerating shock waves in the outer layers of supernovae in galaxies at distances of 30-50 Mpc. It is now known that most GRBs are at cosmological distances, and Paczynski [49] has suggested that more energetic stellar explosions associated with the collapse of rapidly rotating massive stars (“hypernovae”) may underlie GRBs. Some attempts to model the energetics of a gamma-ray burst produced by a spherical explosion of SN1998bw found that the energy in relativistic ejecta was inadequate (e.g., [50]). Extrapolating from a nonrelativistic analysis, however, Matzner & McKee [3] concluded that there was enough energy in relativistic ejecta to produce the observed burst. What was missing from these analyses was the inclusion of the relativistic effects on the hydrodynamics as the shock wave accelerates to velocities near the speed of light. This omission has been rectified by Tan, Matzner, & McKee’s analysis of trans-relativistic blastwaves in supernovae [4].

Shock-acceleration models of GRBs have a great advantage in that they naturally deal with the “baryon-loading problem.” The observed energies of GRBs are so great that any viable model must be highly efficient, putting a significant fraction of the energy into radiation. Shock acceleration models are intrinsically efficient because they concentrate the energy in the outermost, fastest moving material in an explosion.

The dynamics of a nonrelativistic shock in a stellar envelope are described by equation (1). In the outer layers of the envelope, where the enclosed mass $m(r)$ approaches the total ejected mass M_{ej} , this reduces to

$$v_s \propto (\rho_0 r^3)^{-\alpha}, \quad (8)$$

where $\alpha \simeq 0.19$. The shock accelerates if the stellar density ρ_0 falls off faster than $1/r^3$. Gnatyk [51] proposed that a similar relation should hold for trans-relativistic flows, with v_s replaced by $\Gamma_s \beta_s$ and α set equal to 0.2 for accelerating shocks; here $\beta_s = v_s/c$ and $\Gamma_s = (1 - \beta_s^2)^{-1/2}$. Tan et al [4] obtained a more accurate representation of the shock dynamics, which in addition is valid throughout the star:

$$\Gamma_s \beta_s = p(1 + p^2)^{0.12} \quad (9)$$

$$p \equiv A \left[\frac{E_{\text{in}}}{m(r)} \right]^{1/2} \left[\frac{m(r)}{\rho_0 r^3} \right]^{0.187}. \quad (10)$$

This reduces to equation (1) in the nonrelativistic limit.

After the passage of the shock through the stellar envelope, the shocked gas is left with an internal energy that is equal to its kinetic energy. As the shocked gas undergoes adiabatic expansion, this internal energy is converted to kinetic energy; in addition, the inner layers do work on the outer layers. Matzner & McKee [3]

found that as a result the final velocity in a nonrelativistic, planar flow is about twice the post-shock value. In the relativistic case, Tan et al [4] find

$$\frac{\Gamma_f \beta_f}{\Gamma_s \beta_s} = 2.0 + (\Gamma_s \beta_s)^{\sqrt{3}}, \quad (11)$$

where the scaling in the relativistic limit is the same as that found analytically by Johnson & McKee [52]. The effects of spherical expansion reduce $\Gamma_f \beta_f$ somewhat below the planar value.

Based on their nonrelativistic theory, Matzner & McKee [3] estimated the mass of relativistic ejecta in a supernova; for example, for an $n = 4$ polytrope, the mass with $\Gamma_f \beta_f > 1$ is

$$M_{\text{rel}} = 2.7 \times 10^{-6} \left(\frac{E_{\text{in}}}{10^{52} \text{ erg}} \right)^{3.29} \left(\frac{1 M_{\odot}}{M_{\text{ej}}} \right)^{2.29} M_{\odot}. \quad (12)$$

The corresponding energy is

$$M_{\text{rel}} c^2 = 3.1 \times 10^{48} \left(\frac{E_{\text{in}}}{10^{52} \text{ erg}} \right)^{3.29} \left(\frac{1 M_{\odot}}{M_{\text{ej}}} \right)^{2.29} \text{ erg}. \quad (13)$$

Tan et al [4] show that this is a reasonably good estimate for M_{rel} , and furthermore, that the kinetic energy of the ejecta above some value of $\Gamma_f \beta_f$ is

$$E_k \propto F(\Gamma_f \beta_f) M_{\text{rel}} c^2, \quad (14)$$

where (for $n = 4$) $F \propto (\Gamma_f \beta_f)^{-4.69}$ in the nonrelativistic limit and $F \propto (\Gamma_f \beta_f)^{-0.98}$ in the relativistic limit.

To determine if the explosion of SN1998bw had enough energy to power GRB980425, Tan et al used a model of the supernova kindly provided by Stan Woosley. This model, which is consistent with the observed light curve of the supernova, had a Wolf-Rayet progenitor with a mass of $6.55 M_{\odot}$, an ejecta mass of $4.77 M_{\odot}$, and an energy of 2.8×10^{52} erg. Both the analytic theory and numerical simulation yield about 2×10^{48} erg in ejecta with $\Gamma_f \beta_f > 1$; by comparison, the observed energy of the burst was $(8.1 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{47}$ erg, under the assumption that it was in fact associated with the supernova [47]. The energy content of the ejecta therefore appears sufficient to power the burst. In order to release the energy, however, it must first be randomized. This can be done through interaction with the dense stellar wind expected for a Wolf-Rayet star [50]; a mass loss rate of a few times $10^{-4} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ is required. Because the emission is due to the interaction with the ambient medium, this model for GRBs is in fact a YSNR model. Tan et al did not attempt to carry out a calculation of the emitted spectrum, so it remains to be seen whether an approximately spherical shock-acceleration model can account for the observed burst. However, they did show that the characteristic synchrotron energy from such a model is compatible with the observations and that this model can satisfy the constraints imposed by observations of the radio emission [53].

The inferred isotropic energies of GRBs range up to in excess of 10^{54} erg, so if GRB 980425 was in fact associated with SN1998bw, it was a very puny burst. Can shock acceleration models account for these much more luminous cosmological bursts? To address this question, Tan et al considered an extreme hypernova model in which $E_{\text{in}} = 5 \times 10^{54}$ erg is released into about $5M_{\odot}$ of ejecta. Whether such an energetic explosion is possible is not known; whereas most of the energy in a conventional core-collapse supernova is released in the form of neutrinos and possibly gravitational radiation, much of the energy in a hypernova is assumed to go into kinetic form as the result of a rapidly rotating, magnetized black hole at the center [49]. Tan et al find that in this model almost 1% of the explosion energy goes into material with $\Gamma_f \beta_f > 10$. The principal observational limits on the minimum value of $\Gamma_f \beta_f$ come from the constraints that the opacity due to photon-photon interactions and to the external medium be small. These limits in turn depend upon the size of the burst and therefore the timescale of the variations. While some GRBs show very rapid variability, most of the bursts with observed afterglows (and therefore measured energies) are relatively smooth. By assuming that the variations observed in these bursts could be explained by fluctuations in the ambient medium or by instabilities in the ejecta, Tan et al inferred that the minimum values of $\Gamma_f \beta_f$ were of order 10, almost an order of magnitude smaller than the limits inferred by some other workers (see [45]). As a result, they concluded that some of the cosmological GRBs with measured afterglows could be accounted for by an extreme hypernova model with a spherical explosion. However, a number of the bursts were too energetic to be accounted for by such a model. The most likely conclusion is that the cosmological bursts are aspherical, so that the emission is beamed towards us and the actual explosion energy is much smaller than the isotropic value (see [45]). Furthermore, beaming provides the most natural explanation for the optical and X-ray light curves of some bursts, such as GRB 990510 [54] [55].

Tan et al conclude that very young SNRs (including very young hypernova remnants) might indeed be the engines that underlie GRBs. Whereas the explosion that produced the GRB that is believed to be associated with SN1998bw could have been approximately spherical, the explosions associated with the much more energetic cosmological bursts are most likely quite aspherical. The recently launched *HETE-2* spacecraft, the proposed *Swift* mission, and the AASC-recommended *Gamma-ray Large Area Space Telescope (GLAST)* and *EXIST* missions should provide the data that will enable us to finally determine the nature of the enigmatic GRBs.

CONCLUSION: THE CONNECTIONS CHALLENGE

In this brief review, I have tried to show how YSNRs are at the nexus of many important problems in contemporary astrophysics: the late stages of stellar evolution, supernovae, the formation of compact objects, nucleosynthesis, the formation and destruction of interstellar dust, astrophysical gas dynamics, and possibly even gamma-ray bursts. In order for the study of YSNRs to reach its potential, however,

we must overcome a major challenge, which I call the “*Connections Challenge*.” How can one infer the nature of the supernova and its progenitor from observations of the YSNR? Some steps have been taken in this direction for the best-studied YSNRs such as Cas A (e.g., [56]), but much more needs to be done. A key step in this process is to identify the compact object that remains from the explosion, when it exists. In some cases this can be done through observations of radio pulsars. However, the recent discovery of an X-ray point source in Cas A [57] shows that other approaches to this problem are possible and opens up a new window on understanding supernovae and the formation of compact objects [58].

The results presented at this conference show that we are making progress in addressing the challenges I have presented. If the ambitious program for new instruments and theory recommended by the AASC is carried out, the coming decade could well see the resolution of most of these challenges.

Acknowledgments. I wish to thank the organizers for inviting me to an extremely valuable conference. Comments on a draft of this paper by Roger Chevalier, Chris Matzner, and Jonathan Tan are gratefully acknowledged. My research is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant AST 95-30480.

REFERENCES

1. Chevalier, R.A. 1976, ApJ, 207, 872
2. Chevalier, R.A., & Soker, N. 1989, ApJ, 341, 867
3. Matzner, C.D., & McKee, C.F. 1999, ApJ, 510, 379
4. Tan, J.C., Matzner, C.D., & McKee, C.F. 2000, ApJ (in press), astro-ph 0012003
5. Dwarkadas, V.V., & Chevalier, R.A. 1998, ApJ, 497, 807
6. McKee, C. F. 1974, ApJ, 188, 335
7. Hamilton, A.J.S., & Sarazin, C.L. 1984, ApJ, 281, 682
8. Chevalier, R.A. 1982, ApJ, 258, 790
9. Nadyozhin, D.K. 1985, Ap&SS, 112, 225
10. McKee, C.F., & Truelove, J.K. 1995, Phys. Rep., 256, 157
11. Truelove, J.K., & McKee, C.F. 1999, ApJS, 120, 299
12. Truelove, J.K., & McKee, C.F. 2000, ApJS, 128, 403
13. Hughes, J.P. 2000, ApJ (submitted), astro-ph 0010122
14. Chevalier, R.A. 1998, Memorie della Societa Astronomia Italiana, 69, 977
15. Blondin, J.M., Borkowski, K., & Reynolds, S.P. 2000, ApJ (submitted), astro-ph 0010285
16. Maciejewski, W., & Cox, D.P. 1998, ApJ, 511, 792
17. Gull, S.F. 1973, MNRAS, 161, 47
18. Chevalier, R.A., Blondin, J.M., & Emmering, R.T. 1992, ApJ, 392, 118
19. McKee, C.F., & Taylor, J.H. 2001, *Astronomy and Astrophysics in the New Millennium*, National Academy Press (in press).
20. Clayton, D.D. 1975, ApJ, 199, 765
21. Dwek, E. 1998, ApJ, 501, 643
22. Draine, B.T., & Salpeter, E.E. 1979, ApJ, 231, 438

23. McKee, C.F. 1989, in *IAU Symp. 135 Interstellar Dust*, ed. L.J. Allamandola & A.G.G.M. Tielens, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 431
24. Tielens, A.G.G.M., McKee, C.F., Seab, C.G., and Hollenbach, D.J., 1994, *ApJ*, 431, 321
25. Dwek, E., Foster, S.M., & Vancura, O. 1996, *ApJ*, 457, 244
26. Jones, A.P., Tielens, A.G.G.M., & Hollenbach, D.J. 1996, *ApJ*, 469, 740
27. Douvion, T., Lagage, P.O., & Cesarsky, C.J. 1999, *A&A*, 352, L111
28. Arendt, R.G., Dwek, E., & Mosely, S.H. 1999, *ApJ*, 521, 234
29. Hughes, J.P., Rakowski, C.E., & Decourchelle, A. 2000, *ApJ*, 543, L61
30. Ghavamian, P., Raymond, J., Hartigan, P., & Blair, W.P. 2001, *ApJ* (submitted), astro-ph 0010496
31. McKee, C.F. & Cowie, L.L. 1975, *ApJ*, 195, 715
32. McKee, C.F. 1988, in *IAU Colloq. 101, Supernova Remnants and the Interstellar Medium*, ed. R.S. Roger and T.L. Landecker, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 205
33. Klein, R.I., McKee, C.F., & Colella, P. 1994, *ApJ*, 420, 213
34. Klein, R.I., Budil, K.S., Perry, T.S., & Bach, D.R. 2000, *ApJS*, 127, 379
35. McKee, C.F., & Ostriker, J.P. 1977, *ApJ*, 218, 148
36. Begelman, M.C., & Fabian, A.C. 1990, *MNRAS*, 244, 26P
37. Slavin, J.D., Shull, J.M., & Begelman, M.C. 1993, *ApJ*, 407, 83
38. Fesen, R.A., & Gunderson, K.S. 1996, *ApJ*, 470, 967
39. Senda, A., et al 2001, poster 4.03 at this conference
40. van den Bergh, S., & Tammann, G.A. 1991, *Annual Reviews of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 29, 363
41. Tegmark, M., Zaldarriaga, M., & Hamilton, A.J.S. 2000, astro-ph 0008167
42. van den Bergh, S., & McClure, R.D. 1994, *ApJ*, 425, 205
43. McKee, C.F., & Williams, J.P. 1997, *ApJ*, 476, 144
44. Scalo, J. 1986, *Fund. Cosmic Phys.*, 11, 1
45. Piran, T. 1999, *Phys. Reports*, 314, 575
46. Kulkarni, S.R., et al 2000, in *Gamma-Ray Bursts: 5th Huntsville Symposium*, eds, Kippen, R.M., Malozzi, R.S., & Fishman, G.J., New York, AIP, p. 277
47. Galama, T.J., et al 1998, *Nature*, 395, 670
48. Colgate, S.A. 1974, *ApJ*, 187, 333
49. Paczynski, B.P. 1998, in *Gamma-Ray Bursts: 4th Huntsville Symposium*, eds, C.A. Meegan, R.D. Preece, & T.M. Koshut, New York, AIP
50. Woosley, S.E., Eastman, R.G., & Schmidt, B.P. 1999, *ApJ*, 516, 788
51. Gnatyk, B.I. 1985, *Sov. Astron. Lett.*, 11(5), 331
52. Johnson, M.H., & McKee, C.F. 1971, *PRD*, 3, 858
53. Kulkarni, S.R., et al 1998, *Nature*, 395, 663
54. Stanek, K.Z., et al. 1999, *ApJ*, 522, L39
55. Pian, E., et al 2000, *A&A* (submitted), astro-ph 0012107
56. Fesen, R.A., Becker, R.A., & Goodrich, R.W. 1988, *ApJ*, 329, L89
57. Tananbaum, H. 1999, *IAU Circular* 7246
58. Umeda, H., Nomoto, K., Tsuruta, S., & Mineshige, S. 2000, *ApJ*, 534, L193